REMARKS

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 12-22

Claims 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as claimed in claims 12-22 is statutory subject matter and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-27 and 34-40

Claims 1-27 and 34-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van der Schaar, et al., U.S. Patent 6,788,740 (previously cited) in combination with Wu, et al., U.S. Patent 6,700,933 (previously cited) and Keith et al., U.S. Patent 4,785,349.

As the Examiner stated, the combination of Van der Schaar and Wu does not disclose a quantized value having an integer part and a fractional part as claimed, and the Examiner is relying on Keith as disclosing the missing subject matter.

Keith discloses a decompression system that generates pixel values to fill in a frame when the bitstream containing the frame is decompressed. A and B coefficients in the bitstream are dequantized into fractional numbers WA and WB. A fractional value of a region address offset in the frame is used to generate interpolated values. The interpolated values are added to WA and WB to generate the pixel fill values.

Applicant claims a quantized value that has an integer part and a fractional part, where the integer part represents a base layer for the corresponding coefficient and the fractional part represents enhancement layers for the corresponding coefficient. The quantized value is the result of quantizing a coefficient. Keith's A and B coefficients are dequantized into fractional numbers WA and WB, but Keith does not disclose that the WA and WB are quantized values. In fact, Keith teaches that WA and WB are

dequantized values, which is the inverse of a quantized value. Keith's other fractional values are part of a region address offset. A region address offset is not equivalent to a quantized value that is the result of quantizing a coefficient as claimed by Applicant. Moreover, Keith does not teach or suggest that an integer part of a quantized value represents a base layer for the corresponding coefficient or that the fractional part of a quantized value represents enhancement layers for the corresponding coefficient.

Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1-27 and 34-40, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Van der Schaar, Wu and Keith.

Claims 28, 30, 32, 41 and 43

Claims 28, 30, 32, 41 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of De Bonet, et al., U.S. Patent 6,510,177 (previously cited) and Wu.

Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that the Examiner previously admitted that the combination of De Bonet and Wu does not render obvious claims 28, 30, 32, 41 and 43 because the Examiner allowed claims 28, 30, 32, 41 and 43 over the combination of De Bonet and Wu (Office Action, March 6, 2006). Applicant respectfully submits that it is improper for the Examiner to re-assert a rejection that he has previously withdrawn, unless new arguments against patentability are presented. In this case, the current arguments used to reject claims 28, 30, 32, 41 and 43 are the same as the arguments previously presented. Thus, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Nonetheless, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant repeats here Applicant's previous rebuttal arguments, which the Examiner admitted overcome the previous rejection over De Bonet and Wu. The Examiner asserts that De Bonet discloses decoding an enhancement layer bitstream into quantized fractional values as claimed by Applicant. However, De Bonet's enhancements layers are created from DCT or PWC coefficients. De Bonet does not even suggest using fractional values of a quantized coefficient to represent an enhancement layers. In fact, De Bonet does not disclose using the fractional value of a quantized coefficient for any purpose. Thus, De Bonet's decoder

cannot be properly interpreted as decoding an enhancement layer into a quantized fractional value.

The Examiner is relying on Wu as disclosing decoding an enhancement layer into a fractional part of a quantization value for input data. However, Wu's enhancement layers represent residual values. Thus, Wu's decoding of the enhancement layers produces residues, not the fractional part of the quantization value for the input data as claimed.

Therefore, the combination of De Bonet and Wu cannot render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 28, 30, 32, 41 and 43, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-44 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Sue Holloway at (408) 720-8300 x3476.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 9, 2007

Sheryl Sue Holloway
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,850

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300 x3476